

REMARKS**I. Introduction**

In the present application claims 1-3, 6-24, and 26 are currently allowed, claim 53 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), claim 56 is objected to for depending from a rejected claim, and claims 4, 5, 25, 27-52, 54, 55, 57, and 58 are subjected to a restriction requirement. Through this response, claim 53 is amended and claims 27-52, 57, and 58 are canceled. Claim 53 is amended for the purpose of clarifying the required elements. No new matter has been entered. The Applicant respectfully submits that these actions, and the remarks below, place claims 1-26, and 53-56 in condition for allowance. As these are the only claims pending, the Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to pass this application to issue.

II. Interview Summary

In compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.133, the Applicant submits the following interview summaries:

On October 14, 2005, Examiner Jack Dinh and Applicant's attorney James Glenn discussed the rejection of claim 53. No resolution was reached.

On October 14, 2005, Supervisory Patent Examiner Georgia Epps and Applicant's attorney Michael Papalas also discussed the rejection of claim 53. It was agreed that Applicant would amend claim 53 to recite "a beam splitter," and that the Examiner would consider this amendment.

III. Claims 53 and 56

Claim 53 currently stands rejected as anticipated by Corbin, U.S. Patent No. 6,271,808 (hereinafter *Corbin*). However, as amended, claim 53 is a system requiring "a beam splitter." The system cited by the Examiner has no "beam splitter," but rather uses a mirror. The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 53 is, therefore, patentable over the cited art, and respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

Claim 56 stands objected to for depending from claim 53. As demonstrated above, claim 53 is allowable over the cited art, and, thus, the Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claim 56.

IV. The Non-Elected Claims

In the Office Action of March 4, 2005, the Examiner required the election of either Group I (claims 1-3, 6-24, 26, 53, and 56) or Group II (claims 4, 5, 25, 27-52, 54, 55, 57, and 58) for further prosecution. In the Response of June 6, 2005, the Applicant elected, with traverse, Group I. In the Final Action, the Examiner has allowed, among other claims, claims 1, and 20. In this Response, the Applicant demonstrated the claim 53 is allowable. Thus, Claims 4, 5, and 25 depend from allowed claims 1 and 20, and claims 54 and 55 depend from allowable claim 53. In accordance with M.P.E.P. § 809, therefore, the Applicant respectfully ask the Examiner to withdraw the restriction requirement of claims 4, 5, 25, 54, and 55, as each is dependent from an allowed or allowable linking claim.

The remaining claims of Group II, (claims 27-52, 57, and 58) have been canceled.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 54729/P005US/10304870 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: October 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

James A. Glenn, Jr.

Registration No.: 55,898

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800

Dallas, Texas 75201-2784

(214) 855-8000

(214) 855-8200 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant